

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-3, 6-23, 26-71, 80-83, 91, 93-97, have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 121-127 are added. Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, 72-79, 84-90, 92, and 98-127 are pending in this application.

Applicant makes no representation that cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any cited references are prior art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or 35 U.S.C. §103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, 72-79, 84-90, 92, and 103 stand allowed.

New Claims

New claims 121-127 are added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 121-127 are allowable over the cited references for their own recited features.

For example, with respect to new claim 121, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest “in response to receiving input via the GUI requesting to de-allocate the single reservation protocol session that has been established between the first and second media aggregation managers, instructing the first and second media aggregation managers to de-allocate the established single reservation protocol

session”. With respect to new claim 124, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest “receiving, at a first media aggregation device within a network, a request to de-allocate an established single reservation protocol session between the first media aggregation device and a second media aggregation device within the network”, and “wherein the request to de-allocate is received via a graphical user interface (GUI) that presents a representation of the network including the first and second media aggregation devices, and wherein a user selects, via the GUI, the established reservation protocol session from the representation of the network”. With respect to new claim 126, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest “receiving a request to de-allocate an established single reservation protocol session between the first media aggregation device and a second media aggregation device within a network”, and “wherein the request to de-allocate is received via a graphical user interface (GUI) that presents a representation of the network including the first and second media aggregation devices, and wherein the user selects, via the GUI, the established reservation protocol session from the representation of the network”.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 26, 2010

By: /Allan T. Sponseller, Reg. #38,318/
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 755-7255